arXiv:hep-ph/9303204v1 2 Mar 1993

CERN-TH.6806/93

CP Violation in $t\bar{t}$ Production at e^+e^- Colliders

Bohdan Grządkowski[1]

CERN, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland

and

Institute for Theoretical Physics,
University of Warsaw,
Hoża 69, PL-00-681 Warsaw, Poland.

Abstract

The general production *and* decay mechanism of $t\bar{t}$ in future high-energy e^+e^- colliders has been investigated in a model-independent way, focusing on an observation of possible CP violation. Angular asymmetries sensitive to CP violation either in the production *or* in the subsequent decays have been found. General considerations are illustrated through 1-loop effects induced by gluino exchange in the supersymmetric version of the Standard Model.

CERN-TH.6806/93
February 1993

[1]E-mail address: bohdang@cernvm.

1 Introduction

Linear high-energy e^+e^- colliders can prove to be very useful laboratories to study the physics of the top quark. One of the many interesting issues one can investigate there is, for instance, whether or not CP is violated in $t\bar{t}$ production and their subsequent decays. Since at present very little is known experimentally about the properties of the top quark, one can even expect there very unconventional effects. In spite of spectacular successes in experimental high-energy physics (e.g. precision tests of the Standard Model) the origin of CP violation is still a mystery. The standard theory of Kobayashi and Maskawa [1] provides explicit CP violation through phases of Yukawa couplings; however, many other attractive schemes of CP violation may emerge in extensions of the Standard Model. Those unconventional sources of CP violation can be tested in $t\bar{t}$ production at future linear e^+e^- colliders. For instance, CP violation induced by the neutral scalar sector in the two Higgs doublet standard model [2] could lead to observable effects [3] in $e^+e^- \to t\bar{t}$, provided sufficient luminosity could be obtained. One can also imagine some unknown high-scale theory, which induces effective, low-energy CP-violating interactions. The supersymmetric extension of the Standard Model (SSM) can also produce CP violation at the one-loop level both in $t\bar{t}$ production and in the decay [2]. There exists in the literature a number of papers investigating CP violation in the $t\bar{t}$ production *or* in the top decay [5, 6], however usually only production *or* decay is considered [3]. It is clear that in general CP violation may appear in both the production *and* the decay; therefore interference of the two is crucial, as it can even lead to cancellation of both effects. Therefore the aim of this paper is to calculate CP-violating observables consistently, taking both sources of CP violation into account. The problem has been solved by defining two kinds of angular asymmetries, one sensitive to CP violation in the production exclusively and the other in the subsequent decays. Predictions for those asymmetries are then calculated in the supersymmetric extension of the Standard Model, where appropriate one-loop diagrams are induced by the gluino exchange.

2 The Strategy

Recently, Peskin has proposed for pp colliders the following CP-violating asymmetry in the production rates of $t\bar{t}$ pairs with CP-conjugate helicities:

$$\mathcal{A}_P \equiv \frac{\#(--) - \#(++)}{(\text{all } t\bar{t})}, \tag{1}$$

where first and second entries in $(--)/(++)$ are referring to t and $\bar{t}$ helicities, respectively. Since $(--)$ and $(++)$ go into each other under CP, non-zero asymmetry would be a sign of CP violation. An analogous quantity may be defined for $t\bar{t}$ production in e^+e^- colliders as well. Here we address the question how to define appropriate asymmetries in the e^+e^- collisions at the level of $t\bar{t}$ decay products, which would be directly proportional to Peskin's $\mathcal{A}_P$, in other words, how to avoid a contamination of the measurement of

[2] CP violation within the SSM at future pp colliders has recently been considered in Ref. [4].

[3] Ref. [6] is the only exception.

$\mathcal{A}_P$ by CP violation in $t\bar{t}$ decays. Let us assume that the main decay mode of the top quark is $t \to W^+ b$. At the tree level in the high-energy limit the b quark always has helicity $h_b = -$, therefore helicity conservation tells us that W^+ with helicity $\lambda_{W^+} = 0$ coming from the top of $h_t = +$ would like to go forward in the direction of flying top, whereas W^+ with $\lambda_{W^+} = -$ will go mainly in the opposite direction. W^+ emerging from the top of $h_t = -$ with the same helicities as above would obviously go in the opposite direction. An analogous picture holds for the $\bar{t}$ decays. It should be noticed that the allowed helicities of W^+, at the tree level and for massless b quarks, are $\lambda_{W^+} = 0, -$, and that helicity conservation never permits to produce $\lambda_{W^+} = +/-$ together with $h_b = -/+$, respectively. Therefore, it seems natural to consider the following asymmetries:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}} &\equiv \frac{N_{\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}}}{D_{\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}}} \\ N_{\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}} &\equiv \left(\int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} d\theta \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}}^{\pi} d\bar{\theta} - \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}}^{\pi} d\theta \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} d\bar{\theta} \right) \frac{d^2\sigma_{\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}}}{d\theta\, d\bar{\theta}} \\ D_{\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}} &\equiv \int_0^{\pi} d\theta \int_0^{\pi} d\bar{\theta}\, \frac{d^2\sigma_{\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}}}{d\theta\, d\bar{\theta}}, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where θ, $\bar{\theta}$ denote polar angles of W^+, W^- measured in the $t, \bar{t}$ rest frames with respect to $t, \bar{t}$ directions seen from the laboratory frame, respectively. $d^2\sigma_{\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}}/(d\theta\, d\bar{\theta})$ stands for the cross-section obtained by integrating over the full $t\bar{t}$ production phase space and over W^+, W^- azimuthal angles.

Hereafter we will assume that all possible CP-violating effects for the production process $e^+e^- \to t\bar{t}$ can be represented by the photon and Z-boson exchange in the s channel. An elegant method to calculate the asymmetries is to adopt known [8] helicity amplitudes for the $e^+e^- \to t\bar{t}$, expressed through the most general four form factor [4] parametrization of the vertex $V_\mu t\bar{t}$ ($V = \gamma$ or Z):

$$\Gamma^\mu_{Vt\bar{t}} = \frac{ig}{2}\bar{u}(p_t)\left[\gamma^\mu(A_V - B_V\gamma_5) + \frac{p_t - p_{\bar{t}}}{2\,m_t}(C_V - D_V\gamma_5)\right] v(p_{\bar{t}}), \tag{3}$$

where g is the $SU(2)$ gauge coupling constant. A similar parametrization of $t \to W^+ b$ and $\bar{t} \to W^-\bar{b}$ will be adopted:

$$\Gamma^\mu = \frac{-igV^{KM}_{tb}}{\sqrt{2}}\bar{u}(p_b)\left[\gamma^\mu(f_1^L P_L + f_1^R P_R) - \frac{i\sigma^{\mu\nu}k_\nu}{m_W}(f_2^L P_L + f_2^R P_R)\right] u(p_t), \tag{4}$$

$$\bar{\Gamma}^\mu = \frac{-igV^{KM*}_{tb}}{\sqrt{2}}\bar{v}(p_{\bar{t}})\left[\gamma^\mu(\bar{f}_1^L P_L + \bar{f}_1^R P_R) - \frac{i\sigma^{\mu\nu}k_\nu}{m_W}(\bar{f}_2^L P_L + \bar{f}_2^R P_R)\right] v(p_{\bar{b}}), \tag{5}$$

where $P_{R/L}$ are projection operators, k is the W momentum and V^{KM} is the Kobayashi–Maskawa matrix. Again, because W is on shell, two additional form factors do not contribute. It is easy to show that[5]:

$$f_1^{L,R} = \pm\bar{f}_1^{L,R}, \qquad f_2^{L,R} = \pm\bar{f}_2^{R,L}, \tag{6}$$

[4]Two other possible form factors do not contribute in the limit of zero electron mass.

[5]We thank W.Bernreuther for pointing an error in third paper of Ref. [5], where signs of the second equation were reversed.

where the upper (lower) signs are those for contributions induced by CP-conserving (-violating) interactions.

Amplitudes for W^+W^- helicities $(0,0)$ and $(-+)$ could be written in terms of amplitudes for $e^+e^- \to t\bar{t}$ production $(h_{e^-}, h_{e^+}, h_t, h_{\bar{t}})$ and for t $(h_t, \lambda_{W^+}, h_b)$ and $\bar{t}$ $\overline{(h_{\bar{t}}, \lambda_{W^-}, h_{\bar{b}})}$ decays, as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_{\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}} &= \sum_{h_{e^+}h_{e^-}} M^{h_{e^-}h_{e^+}}_{\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}} \qquad (7)\\
M^{-+}_{00} &= (-+--)(-0-)\overline{(-0+)} + (-+-+)(-0-)\overline{(+0+)} + \\
&\quad (-++-)(+0-)\overline{(-0+)} + (-+++)(+0-)\overline{(+0+)}\\
M^{-+}_{-+} &= (-+--)(---)\overline{(-++)} + (-+-+)(---)\overline{(+++)} + \\
&\quad (-++-)(+--)\overline{(-++)} + (-+++)(+--)\overline{(+++)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Since we are interested in the leading contribution to the asymmetries (which is an interference between one-loop and tree-level diagrams) all other amplitudes, which in general should be included above, have been neglected. In order to obtain the amplitudes $M^{+-}_{\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}}$ one has to exchange h_{e^+} and h_{e^-} on the right-hand side of the last two formulas. One should notice that the direct multiplication of helicity amplitudes without t and $\bar{t}$ propagators is allowed only under the so-called narrow width approximation, which effectively means that a $t\bar{t}$ pair is produced on shell and then decays. Since $\Gamma_t \simeq 175\,\mathrm{MeV}(\frac{m_t}{m_W})^3 \ll m_t$, therefore the approximation is justified.

Now we are in a position to calculate the asymmetries. Adopting helicity amplitudes from Ref. [8], after straightforward algebra one gets:

$$
N_{00} = -\frac{8}{3}\pi^2\left(\frac{m_t}{m_W}\right)^4 S\beta(tQ_e)^2 \sum_{i=L,R}(A^{(0)}_\gamma + r_i A^{(0)}_Z)\mathrm{Re}\{D^{(1)}_\gamma + r_i D^{(1)}_Z\} \qquad (8)
$$

$$
D_{00} = \frac{8}{3}\pi^2\left(\frac{m_t}{m_W}\right)^4 S(tQ_e)^2 \sum_{i=L,R}[(3-\beta^2)(A^{(0)}_\gamma + r_i A^{(0)}_Z)^2 + 2(r_i\beta B^{(0)}_Z)^2], \qquad (9)
$$

where

$$
\begin{array}{llllll}
\beta &= [1-\frac{4m_t^2}{S}]^{1/2}, & t &= 1-\frac{m_Z^2}{S},\\
r_i &= \frac{e_i}{tQ_e}, & & \\
Q_e &= -s_\theta, & Q_t &= \frac{2}{3}s_\theta,\\
e_L &= \frac{1}{c_\theta}(-\frac{1}{2}+s^2_\theta), & e_R &= \frac{1}{c_\theta}s^2_\theta,\\
A^{(0)}_\gamma &= 2Q_t, & A^{(0)}_Z &= \frac{1}{2c_\theta}(1-\frac{8}{3}s^2_\theta),\\
B^{(0)}_Z &= \frac{1}{2c_\theta}. & &
\end{array}
$$

S is the total c.m. energy and s_θ/ c_θ denote the sine and cosine of the Weinberg angle, respectively; $A^{(0)/(1)}_{\gamma/Z}$ and $B^{(0)/(1)}_{\gamma/Z}$ stand for form factors defined in Eq.(3), calculated at tree or one-loop level for γ or Z vertices. Part of common factors, corresponding to the helicity matrix element factorization adopted in Ref. [8] has been dropped in N_{00} and D_{00}.

We can see that $\mathcal{A}_{00}$ satisfies our expectations: *it is sensitive exclusively to CP violation during production*, the decays enter at the tree level only (and therefore they do not violate

CP). One can easy check that, assuming tree-level couplings in the production, because of a fortunate choice for angular integration, that all CP-violating effects from decays cancel in the asymmetry.

It turns out that for $(\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}) = (-+)$ we obtain:

$$N_{-+} = -4\left(\frac{m_W}{m_t}\right)^4 N_{00}, \quad D_{-+} = 4\left(\frac{m_W}{m_t}\right)^4 D_{00}. \tag{10}$$

Therefore the asymmetries read:

$$\mathcal{A}_{00} = -\beta\frac{\sum_{i=L,R}(A_\gamma^{(0)} + r_i A_Z^{(0)})\mathrm{Re}\{D_\gamma^{(1)} + r_i D_Z^{(1)}\}}{\sum_{i=L,R}[(3-\beta^2)(A_\gamma^{(0)} + r_i A_Z^{(0)})^2 + 2(r_i\beta B_Z^{(0)})^2]}, \tag{11}$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{-+} = -\mathcal{A}_{00}. \tag{12}$$

Except for $(\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}) = (00), (-+)$, there are of course two more configurations $(0+)$ and (-0), which can also appear in the final state even at the tree level. However, in that case it is more appropriate to consider the following asymmetry:

$$\mathcal{A}_{dec} \equiv \frac{N_{0+} + N_{-0}}{D_{0+} + D_{-0}}. \tag{13}$$

Using a method analogous to that above and dropping the same common factors in numerator and denominator, one obtains:

$$\begin{aligned} N_{0+} + N_{-0} &= -\frac{64}{3}\pi^2\frac{m_t(m_t^2 - m_W^2)}{m_W^3}S\beta(tQ_e)^2\mathrm{Re}\{\bar{f}_2^L - f_2^R\}B_Z^{(0)}\sum_{i=L,R} r_i(A_\gamma^{(0)} + r_i A_Z^{(0)}) \\ D_{0+} + D_{-0} &= 4\left(\frac{m_W}{m_t}\right)^2 D_{00}. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

From Eq.(6) we see that all CP-conserving contributions cancel in the difference $\mathrm{Re}\{\bar{f}_2^L - f_2^R\}$ and we obtain the purely CP-violating effect $-2\,\mathrm{Re}\{f_{2\,CP}^R\}$. Therefore $\mathcal{A}_{dec}$ reads:

$$\mathcal{A}_{dec} = 4\beta\left(\frac{m_t}{m_W} - \frac{m_W}{m_t}\right)\mathrm{Re}\{f_{2\,CP}^R\}B_Z^{(0)}\frac{\sum_{i=L,R} r_i(A_\gamma^{(0)} + r_i A_Z^{(0)})}{\sum_{i=L,R}[(3-\beta^2)(A_\gamma^{(0)} + r_i A_Z^{(0)})^2 + 2(r_i\beta B_Z^{(0)})^2]}. \tag{15}$$

One should notice, however, that it is not the real part of the f_2^R form factor that is the sign of CP violation, but the real part of its CP-violating component. Now, it is obvious, that if one just naïvely considers the tree-level SM-type top-quark decays and include all possible W helicities, then contributions from $(\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}) = (0+), (-0)$ are the ones that contaminate CP violation in the production. Defining $\mathcal{A}_{dec}$ we have not only avoided the contamination of the measurement, but *also* we have found an effective method to measure CP violation purely in the decay. Therefore, in order to isolate CP violation in the production and maximalize the number of events one should measure the following quantity:

$$\mathcal{A}_{tot} \equiv \frac{N_{00} + N_{-+}}{D_{00} + D_{-+}} = -\frac{4m_W^4 - m_t^4}{4m_W^4 + m_t^4}\mathcal{A}_{00}. \tag{16}$$

However, one should also keep in mind that increasing the top-quark mass m_t the rate Γ_T for production of the transversal ($\lambda_{W^+} = -$) W component is reduced with respect to the longitudinal ($\lambda_{W^+} = 0$) one Γ_L. According to Ref. [9] we have:

$$\frac{\Gamma_L}{\Gamma_T} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{m_t}{m_W}\right)^2. \tag{17}$$

Therefore, for a very heavy top quark ($m_t \gg m_W$), $\mathcal{A}_{tot}$ reduces to the initial $\mathcal{A}_{00}$, as independently seen from the above Eq.(16).

Decay modes with $(\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}) = (0+), (-0)$ also provide another interesting asymmetry obtained from that defined in Eq.(3) by a modification of the $\bar{\theta}$ integration region:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}} &\equiv \frac{\tilde{N}_{\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}}}{D_{\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}}} \\ \tilde{N}_{\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}} &\equiv \left(\int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} d\theta \int_0^{\frac{\pi}{2}} d\bar{\theta} - \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}}^{\pi} d\theta \int_{\frac{\pi}{2}}^{\pi} d\bar{\theta}\right) \frac{d^2\sigma_{\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}}}{d\theta\, d\bar{\theta}}, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

for $(\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}) = (0+), (-0)$. The result is:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{-0} = -\mathcal{A}_{00}\,, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{0+} = +\mathcal{A}_{00}, \tag{19}$$

3 The Asymmetries in a Supersymmetric Standard Model

Both $\mathcal{A}_{\lambda_{W^+}\lambda_{W^-}}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{dec}$ are induced by terms that cannot be present at tree level in any renormalizable theory. Therefore they may appear either as an artifact of some unknown high-scale theory in an effective low-energy Lagrangian or they can be generated at the loop level in the SM or its extensions. In the SM both D and $f_2^R{}_{CP}$ vanish, even at the one-loop level; we therefore illustrate the above general consideration by the one-loop-generated D in the SSM. For our purpose the most relevant new source of CP violation, which appears in the SSM, would be the phase of gluino (λ^a), top quark and top squark ($\tilde{t}$) coupling:

$$\mathcal{L} = i\sqrt{2}g_s[e^{i\phi}\tilde{t}_L^* T^a(\bar{\lambda}^a t_L) + e^{-i\phi}\tilde{t}_R^* T^a(\bar{\lambda}^a t_R)] + \text{h.c.}, \tag{20}$$

where g_s is the QCD coupling constant. The stop quarks of different handedness are related to the stop-quark mass eigenstates $\tilde{t}_1$, $\tilde{t}_2$ through the following rotation:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{t}_L &= \tilde{t}_1 \cos\alpha + \tilde{t}_2 \sin\alpha \\ \tilde{t}_R &= -\tilde{t}_1 \sin\alpha + \tilde{t}_2 \cos\alpha \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

As we will see, CP-violating effects vanish for degenerated $\tilde{t}_{1/2}$ masses and are proportional to the product $\sin 2\alpha \sin 2\phi$. However, the same quantity appears in the formula for the neutron's electric dipole moment (EDM); we therefore have to take into account limits originating from the EDM measurement. As estimated in Ref. [4] for $\sin 2\alpha \sin 2\phi = 1$ the

maximal allowed splitting between stop-quark masses is roughly 400 GeV, we will satisfy this bound in our calculations.[6] The result for $\mathrm{Re}\{D_{\gamma/Z}\}$ is the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Re}\{D_\gamma\} &= -\delta_{CP}\frac{8s_W}{3\pi\beta^2}[\mathrm{Im}(1,1)-\mathrm{Im}(2,2)] \\
\mathrm{Re}\{D_Z\} &= \delta_{CP}\frac{2}{c_W\pi\beta^2} \\
&\left[\left(\cos^2\alpha-\frac{4}{3}s_W^2\right)\mathrm{Im}(1,1)-\cos 2\alpha\,\mathrm{Im}(1,2)-\left(\sin^2\alpha-\frac{4}{3}s_W^2\right)\mathrm{Im}(2,2)\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where

$$\delta_{CP}=\alpha_{QCD}\frac{m_\lambda m_t}{S}\sin 2\alpha\sin 2\phi \tag{23}$$

and $\mathrm{Im}(ij)$ (given in the Appendix) corresponds to the exchange of $\tilde{t}_i,\tilde{t}_j$ in the loop (see Fig. **??**).

First, we assume that δ_{CP} can reach its maximum for $\alpha=\phi=\pi/4$, and then we adjust squark masses to obtain $\mathrm{Re}\{D\}$ as big as possible. Notice that for such angles there is no mixed $(1,2)$ contribution in the loop. Since we need an imaginary part for the diagram (see Appendix), in order to maximalize the effect we choose one stop quark ($\tilde{t}_1$) as light as experimentally allowed: $\tilde{t}_1$ can be as light as $m_Z/2$ [11], so we fix its mass m_1 at 50 GeV and vary m_2, the mass of the remaining stop. It is clear that CP violation vanishes if $m_1=m_2$, therefore the biggest contribution can be obtained if m_2 is shifted above the threshold for $\tilde{t}_2$ production. Our results correspond to $m_2=250\,\mathrm{GeV}$, which is of course allowed by bounds from Ref. [4].

Two diagrams ($V=\gamma,Z$) contributing to D_V are shown in Fig. **??**.

It is easy to notice that there are no contributions to D from self-energy diagrams. As seen from the formula for $\mathrm{Re}\{D_{\gamma/Z}\}$ only an absorptive part of the vertex is necessary.

The results for $\mathcal{A}_{00}$ at future high-energy e^+e^- linear collider of $\sqrt{S}=500\,\mathrm{GeV}$ are presented in Fig. **??**. For the gluino mass we use $m_\lambda=200.\mathrm{GeV}$. The maximal asymmetry is about 0.6 %.

As discussed above, in order to maximalize the number of events one should measure $\mathcal{A}_{tot}$, which we plot in Fig. **??**. The biggest asymmetry is about 0.5 %. For the most optimistic proposal of 500 GeV linear collider [12] the total integrated luminosity is $8.5\times10^4\ \mathrm{pb}^{-1}\mathrm{yr}^{-1}$, therefore the SM cross-section for $t\bar{t}$ production (0.66 pb at $m_t=150$ GeV) [12] predicts about $N\simeq5000$ events per year. This means that the smallest possible measurable asymmetry is about $1/\sqrt{N}=0.4$ %. One should also have in mind that the above estimates do not include any cuts and, of course, some number of events must be lost because of non-perfect efficiency. The results that we have obtained here presumed the narrow width approximation, where all possible interference effects between production and decay are neglected. In order to justify this we must in addition assume that the final (Wb) mass resolution is sufficiently good to be sure that W and b

[6] It should be stressed here that we are not restricting ourselves to the minimal supergravity-induced models. Therefore the bounds on CP-violating parameters from neutron's EDM measurements are rather weak. However, as showed in Ref. [10], even the supersymmetric Standard Model based on supergravity allows for maximal CP-violating phases for sufficiently heavy squarks, therefore it is legitimate to use $\phi=\pi/4$.

are coming from on-shell top quarks. There is still a problem of identification of the W helicities. However, it is useful to notice here that, because of helicity conservation, e^+ coming from W^+ with $\lambda_{W^+} = 0$ would like to go either along the W direction or opposite to it with the same probability. In the case of $\lambda_{W^+} = -$, e^+ would strongly prefer to fly against the original W direction. That observation should be helpful in the process of W helicity identification; however, any qualitative analysis would require a dedicated Monte Carlo, which is obviously beyond the scope of this paper.

We must conclude that the maximal SSM asymmetries will be just at the edge of possible observability at planned $\sqrt{S} = 500\,\mathrm{GeV}$ colliders.

The general consideration presented above assume that the main t decay mode is $t \to W^+ b$, which may not be true in extensions of the SM. Also our example within the SSM needs the extra assumption that, in spite of very light $\tilde{t}_1$, $t \to W^+ b$ still dominates. This means that zino ($\tilde{Z}$) and photino ($\tilde{\gamma}$) must be sufficiently heavy to forbid otherwise competitive decays: $t \to \tilde{t}_1(\tilde{Z}/\tilde{\gamma})$.

It is worthwhile to emphasize here that the asymmetries in the SSM are induced by the strong interaction (gluino exchange) and it is therefore hard to imagine that any bigger asymmetry would appear at the one-loop level.

In Fig. **??** we show the $\mathcal{A}_{00}$ dependence on $\sqrt{S}$ for different top-quark masses. It is amusing to notice that the biggest asymmetry is always obtained for $\sqrt{S}$ close to 500 GeV.

One more comment is needed here, namely the asymmetries considered in this paper are really CP violation observables; one can check, for instance by direct calculation, that gluonic and photonic vertex corrections do not generate any contributions to the asymmetries, even though they develop non-zero absorptive parts.

The gluino exchange contributes also to the $t \to W^+ b$ and therefore one may calculate $f_{2\,CP}^{R}$ at the one-loop level. However, because in this case also the bottom sector enters, the result would involve too many unconstrained parameters. Therefore that calculation will not be presented here.

4 Summary

CP violation in the production *and* decay of $t\bar{t}$ at future high energy linear colliders has been discussed in a general model-independent way. Since experimentally one can never separate the top-quark production and its decay, the two mechanisms must be considered simultaneously. In order to avoid mixing of CP violation in the production and the decay we have defined the amplitudes sensitive to one or the other mechanism. It turns out that when the asymmetries are induced by gluino exchange the maximal asymmetry will be just at the level of observability, assuming the most optimistic scenario. Nevertheless, they should be searched experimentally, as their possible measurement could also be a signal of some high scale, unknown CP-violating theory.

Appendix

The function $\mathrm{Im}(i,j)$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathrm{Im}(i,j) \;=\; \mathrm{Im}\{B_0(p_{\bar{t}}; m_\lambda^2, m_j^2) + B_0(-p_t; m_\lambda^2, m_i^2) - 2B_0(p_t + p_{\bar{t}}; m_i^2, m_j^2) +$$

$$-[m_i^2+m_j^2-S-2(m_\lambda^2-m_t^2)]C_0(-p_t,p_{\bar{t}};m_\lambda^2,m_i^2,m_j^2)\}.$$

B_0 and C_0 are standard 2- and 3-point scalar one-loop integrals:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tfrac{i}{16\pi^2}B_0(k;m_1^2,m_2^2) &\equiv \mu^{4-n}\int\frac{d^nr}{(2\pi)^n}\frac{1}{[r^2-m_1^2+i\varepsilon][(r+k)^2-m_2^2+i\varepsilon]}\\
\tfrac{-i}{16\pi^2}C_0(k,p;m_1^2,m_2^2,m_3^2) &\equiv\\
\mu^{4-n}\int\frac{d^nr}{(2\pi)^n}&\frac{1}{[r^2-m_1^2+i\varepsilon][(r+k)^2-m_2^2+i\varepsilon][(r+p)^2-m_3^2+i\varepsilon]}
\end{aligned}$$

where μ is the regularization scale. Imaginary parts of those integrals are, of course, finite and are given below for the relevant configurations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Im}\{B_0(k;m^2,m^2)\} &= \frac{\pi}{k^2}w(k^2,m^2,m^2)\Theta(k^2-4m^2)\\
\mathrm{Im}\{C_0(-p_t,p_{\bar{t}};m_\lambda^2,m_t^2,m_t^2)\} &= \frac{\pi}{S\beta}\log\left[\frac{m_1^2+m_2^2+2(m_t^2-m_\lambda^2)-S-\beta w(S,m_1^2,m_2^2)}{m_1^2+m_2^2+2(m_t^2-m_\lambda^2)-S+\beta w(S,m_1^2,m_2^2)}\right]\\
&\quad\Theta[S-(m_1+m_2)^2],
\end{aligned}$$

where $w(a,b,c)$ is the standard kinematic function:

$$w(a,b,c) = [(a+b-c)^2-4ab]^{1/2}.$$

References

[1] K.Kobayashi and T.Maskawa, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **49** (1973) 652.

[2] S.Weinberg, *Phys. Rev.* **D42** (1990) 860.

[3] D.Chang, W.-Y. Keung and I.Phillips, CERN preprint CERN-TH.6658/92.

[4] C.R.Schmidt, *Phys. Lett.* **293B** (1992) 111.

[5] W.Bernreuther and O.Nachtmann, *Phys. Lett.* **268B** (1991) 424; W.Bernreuther, T.Schröder and T.N.Pham, *Phys. Lett.* **279B** (1992) 389; B.Grządkowski and J.F.Gunion, *Phys. Lett.* **287B** (1992) 237; R.Cruz, B.Grządkowski and J.F.Gunion, *Phys. Lett.* **289B** (1992) 440; D.Atwood and A.Soni, *Phys. Rev.* **D45** (1992) 2405; W.Bernreuther, J.P.Ma and T.Schröder, Heidelberg preprint HD-THEP92-30.

[6] W.Bernreuther, O.Nachtmann, O.Overmann and T.Schröder, Heidelberg preprint HD-THEP-92-14; A.Brandenburg and J.P.Ma, Heidelberg preprint HD-THEP-92-42.

[7] C.R.Schmidt and M.E.Peskin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69** (1992) 410.

[8] G.L.Kane, G.A.Ladinsky and C.-P.Yuan, *Phys. Rev.* **D45** (1992) 124; R.H.Dalitz and G.R.Goldstein, *Phys. Rev.* **D45** (1992) 1531.

[9] F.J.Gilman and R.Kauffman, *Phys. Rev.* **D37** (1988) 2676.

[10] Y.Kizukuri and N.Oshimo, *Phys. Rev.* **D46** (1992) 3025.

[11] H.Baer *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D44** (1991) 725.

[12] G.Bagliesi *et al.*, CERN preprint CERN-PPE/92-05.